

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**I. Introduction**

This amendment is submitted in response to the non-final office action dated August 6, 2003. Claim 39 has been canceled. Claims 16 and 17 have been amended to more distinctly claim the invention without affecting the patentable nature of the claimed subject matter. Claim 40 has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-38 and 40 are now pending.

In the Office Action the Examiner rejected the claims as being obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103 based on various combinations of references. **Each of the various combinations of references used to rejected the claims relies no U.S. Patent No. 5,835,570 to Wattenbarger** which the Examiner cites for allegedly disclosing a particular feature of the claims. As will be discussed below, since this reference fails to disclose or render obvious the claimed feature, none of the claims are anticipated or obvious in view of the applied references.

II. Summary of the Invention

The present invention is directed to a speech recognition system that includes advanced subscriber records which include a significant amount of information, e.g., a corporate dialer identifier used to identify a corporate dialer which is to be used when a spoken name does not match any of the names in the subscriber's voice dialing record. The subscriber record

may also include multiple names corresponding to a set of phone numbers, a set of multiple phone numbers corresponding to a name and phone number identifiers, e.g., location identifiers, which are used in combination with a name to uniquely identify a phone number to be dialed.

By including a corporate dialer identifier in the subscriber record, and using the identified dialer when a spoken name is not matched to a name in the subscriber's voice dialing record, a hierarchal voice dialing system is provided where a subscriber's personal voice dialing record will supercede that of a corporate dialer but the corporate dialer will be consulted in cases where a name does not match the subscriber's personal voice dialing record. This feature is particularly beneficial for individuals who normally rely on a corporate voice dialer but would like to add additional names to the voice dialing system which are personal to the particular subscriber.

The advanced subscriber voice dialing records which include a corporate voice dialer identifier and the hierarchical voice dialing technique which uses a corporate voice dialer identifier stored in a subscriber's voice dialing record are not taught, disclosed, or suggested by the applied prior art references.

III. The Wattenberger Patent
DOES NOT DISCLOSE THE CLAIMED FEATURES

The Wattenberger patent describes accessing a directory assistance service when a spoken voice label, e.g., name, is not contained within a subscriber's personal telephone list. However, it does NOT teach, disclose or suggest storing a directory assistance service identifier let along a corporate dialer identifier in a subscriber's personal telephone list.

The summary portion of the Wattenberger patent cited by the Examiner describes accessing a directory assistance service but does not explain how this is done. Col. 2, line 60-65, which the Examiner cites, state:

... When the spoken voice label is not one of the voice labels stored in the memory, the controller retrieves from a directory assistance service database the telephone number associated with a party name label corresponding to the spoken voice label.

To understand how this is occurs, it is necessary to review the detailed description which provides an example at Col. 5, lines 21-43:

The following example illustrates the situation when the spoken voice label is not contained in the subscriber's personal list in memory space 54. When the subscriber gains access to AVL 24, the subscriber is prompted by one of the plurality of voice response units 44 with "Whom would you like to call?" The subscriber might respond with the voice label "Pete Wilson," for example.

Since, for this example, Pete Wilson is not contained in the subscriber's personal list, no match is found and AVL 24 responds, "<Pete Wilson> is not on your list. Would you like Directory Service?", where the voice label appearing within < > is a playback of the recorded utterance of the voice label by the subscriber. For this example, the subscriber replies "Yes". AVL 24 then prompts with "What state, please?" The subscriber responds "California." AVL 24 continues with "What city?" The subscriber replies with "Sacramento." AVL 24 follows with "Please hold."

At this point, the directory services for Sacramento, Calif. is called by AVL 24 and the telephone number for "<Pete Wilson>" is requested from the directory service. If no unique listing were given, the subscriber is connected to a directory service operator for any necessary interaction for identifying the correct Pete Wilson. When the correct listing is found, AVL system 24 captures the telephone number using automatic speech recognition processing for the automatic number report, if necessary, and prompts the subscriber with "Calling <Pete Wilson>. Say 'cancel' to cancel. (Bold added for emphasis)"

Note that the directory assistance service which is contacted is identified based on the user's reply to prompts for state and city information which are presented to the user after the label can not be identified.

Applicants respectfully submit that prompting the user for information identifying a directory assistance service at the time of making a call clearly teaches away from STORING a corporate dialer identifier in the subscriber's record which identifies a corporate

dialer to be used in the event that a name included in the subscriber's record is not detected by the voice dialing system in received speech.

IV. The Pending Claims are Patentable

Representative Claim 1 recites:

A voice dialing system for use with the Internet, the system comprising:

a data storage device for storing voice dialing subscriber records, at least one of said voice dialing subscriber records including a plurality of names, a telephone number being associated with each of said names, and a corporate dialer identifier which identifies a corporate dialer to be used in the event that a name included in the subscriber's record is not detected in speech received in regard to a voice dialing call;

a first computer system for coupling a voice dialing subscriber to the Internet;

a second computer system coupled to the Internet, the second computer system including means for updating a voice dialing subscriber record in response to voice dialing information received from the subscriber via the Internet;

a telephone switch; and

means for generating a telephone number corresponding to speech coupled to the telephone switch, the second computer system, and the data storage device.

Notably, nothing in the cited portion of the Wattenbarger patent describes a voice dialing subscriber record including:

a corporate dialer identifier which identifies a corporate dialer to be used in the event that a name included in the subscriber's record is not detected in speech received in regard to a voice dialing call.

In fact, as discussed above, the interactive manner by which the voice directory assistance service is determined in the Wattenbarger patent during a call attempt from a user's reply to prompts for state and city information teaches away from using a stored corporate dialer identifier in the manner recited in claim 1.

The other references applied by the Examiner do not show, teach or discuss the use of the claimed stored corporate dialer identifier.

Accordingly, claim 1 and the claims which depend there from are patentable over the applied prior art references. Each of the other independent claims, i.e., claims 16 and 31 are patentable for similar reasons to those discussed above that render claim 1 patentable. Accordingly, all the pending claims are patentable over the applied prior art references.

V. Request For Clarification

If the Examiner persists in any of the rejections, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner
1) identify what in the Wattenbarger patent the Examiner contends is "a corporate dialer identifier" as recited in pending claim 1 and where the Wattenbarger patent

describes the corporate identifier being stored in at least one of a plurality of voice dialing subscriber records where the record includes the content recited in claim 1.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the applicants request that the Examiner pass this application to issue.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael P. Straub, Reg. No. 36,941 for:

November 6, 2003

Loren Swingle

Loren Swingle, Attorney
Reg. No. 32,764
(914) 644-2366

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper (and any accompanying paper(s)) is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patents and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

Michael P. Straub

Type or print name of person signing certification

Michael P. Straub

Signature

November 6, 2003

Date